

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested. This Supplemental Amendment augments the Amendment filed on March 24, 2008, the entire contents of which being incorporated herein by reference. Furthermore, the present Supplemental Amendment is made in light of the interview with Examiner Huynh on March 27, 2008. During the interview, the Amendment of March 24, 2008 was discussed, and Examiner Huynh requested further clarification of the claim language.

Applicants have complied with this request by further amending Claim 9 to clarify the scope of protection being sought. In particular, amended Claim 9 is directed to a tuning device having a tuner unit that generates a transport stream from a received service having (1) a plurality of program contents, and (2) complete service information associated with said plurality of program contents. The partial transport stream is a subset of the plurality of program contents. A service information control unit is configured to extract the complete service information from said transport stream in a first mode of operation, and distributes the complete service information without said partial transport stream or said transport stream to an output device connected to the tuning device. In a second mode of operation, the control unit is configured to send the partial transport stream. The complete service information is descriptive of the content conveyed by the partial transport stream and a remaining portion of said plurality of program contents.

Support for the present amendment is found, for example at paragraphs [0013]-[0014] and Figure 1. Thus no new matter is added.

The amendment to Claim 9 should clarify that the transport stream carries a plurality of program contents, and it is generated from a received service that includes both the transport stream and complete service information. The term “complete” is intended to

describe the service information that is associated with all of the plurality of program contents. Thus the complete service information would have service information for not only a single program, but also for other programs. The partial transport stream is a subset of the plurality of program contents, and thus is capable of carrying a single program content but not all of the plurality of program contents.

Furthermore, the service information control unit (referred to in Figure 1) operates in a first mode of operation that distributes the complete service information without either the transport stream or the partial transport stream. A user of the output device may identify which program content, described by the complete service information, is of interest to the user and then place a request for the partial transport stream associated with that particular program. Then, in a second mode of operation, the control unit sends the partial transport stream to the output device.

A significant advantage with this approach as compared to conventional devices is that a second demultiplexer is not required in the TV set (see paragraph [0008]). Also, a limited amount of bandwidth is used by not transmitting the complete service information when transmitting the partial transport stream.

In light of the amendments to Claim 9, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 9 patentably defines over Kawamura, as Kawamura provides no teaching or suggestion of operating in a first mode of operation in which complete service information is distributed without the partial transport stream or the transport stream, and then in a second mode of operation that sends the partial transport stream. In fact Kawamura appears to operate in a completely different principle, namely conveying particular channel and program information, and not complete service information as claimed. Since Inoue does not teach or suggest these features, it is respectfully submitted that no matter how Kawamura and Inoue

are combined, the combination does not teach or suggest all of the elements of Claim 9, as amended.

In view of the amendment to Claim 9 and the above remarks it is respectfully submitted that Claim 9 as well as each of the dependent claims patentably define over the asserted prior art. The present application is therefore believed to be in condition for formal allowance and an early and favorable reconsideration of this application is therefore requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

BDL\la:cbw